arXiv:1602.06227v1 [math.GN] 19 Feb 2016

COMPARING FRÉCHET-URYSOHN FILTERS WITH TWO PRE-ORDERS

S. GARCIA-FERREIRA AND J. E. RIVERA-GÓMEZ

Abstract. A filter $\mathcal{F}$ on ω is called Fréchet-Urysohn if the space with only one non-isolated point $\omega\cup\{\mathcal{F}\}$ is a Fréchet-Urysohn space, where the neighborhoods of the non-isolated point are determined by the elements of $\mathcal{F}$. In this paper, we distinguish some Fréchet-Urysohn filters by using two pre-orderings of filters: One is the Rudin-Keisler pre-order and the other one was introduced by Todorčević-Uzcátegui in [11]. In this paper, we construct an RK-chain of size $\mathfrak{c}^+$ which is RK-above of avery FU-filter. Also, we show that there is an infinite RK-antichain of FU-filters.

1. Notation and preliminaries

All filters will be taken on ω and be free. For an infinite set X, we let $[X]^{<\omega} = \{A \subseteq X : |A| < \omega\}$ and $[X]^{\omega} = \{A \subseteq X : |A| = \omega\}$. For $A, B \in [\omega]^{\omega}$, $A \subseteq^* B$ means that $A \setminus B$ is finite. If $S \in [\omega]^{\omega}$, we say that $S \to \mathcal{F}$ if $S \subseteq^* F$ for every $F \in \mathcal{F}$. If $\mathcal{F}$ is a filter, then $C(\mathcal{F}) = \{S \in [\omega]^{\omega} : S \to \mathcal{F}\}$ is the set of all sequences converging to $\mathcal{F}$. For a filter $\mathcal{F}$, we let $\mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{F}} = \{\omega \setminus F : F \in \mathcal{F}\}$ (*the dual ideal*) and for an ideal $\mathcal{I}$, we let $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{I}} = \{\omega \setminus I : I \in \mathcal{I}\}$ (*the dual filter*). If $\mathcal{F}$ is a filter and $f : \omega \to \omega$ is a function, then we define the filter $f[\mathcal{F}] = \{F : f^{-1}(F) \in \mathcal{F}\}$. For $A \in [\omega]^{\omega}$, we define $\mathcal{F}_r(A) = \{B \subseteq A : |A \setminus B| < \omega\}$. In particular, $\mathcal{F}_r(\omega) := \mathcal{F}_r$ is the *Fréchet filter*. We say that an infinite family $\mathcal{A} \subseteq [\omega]^{\omega}$ is *almost disjoint* (AD-family) if $A \cap B$ is finite for distinct $A, B \in \mathcal{A}$. The ideal generated by an AD-family $\mathcal{A}$ is $\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{A}) = \{X \subseteq \omega : \exists \mathcal{A}' \in [\mathcal{A}]^{<\omega}(X \subseteq^* \bigcup \mathcal{A}')\}$. An AD-family $\mathcal{A}$ is called *maximal almost disjoint* (MAD-*family*) if it is not contained properly in another AD-family. More general, if $\mathcal{B} \subseteq [\omega]^{\omega}$, then we say that a family $\mathcal{A}$ is *maximal* in $\mathcal{B}$ if $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{B}$ and for every $B \in \mathcal{B}$ there is $A \in \mathcal{A}$ such that $|A \cap B| = \omega$. For a nonempty $\mathcal{A} \subseteq [\omega]^{\omega}$, we define $\mathcal{A}^{\perp} = \{B \in [\omega]^{\omega} : \forall A \in \mathcal{A}(|A \cap B| < \omega)\}$, $\mathcal{A}^{+} = \{B \in [\omega]^{\omega} : \forall A \in \mathcal{A}(|A \cap B| \neq \emptyset)\}$ and $\mathcal{A}^{*} = \{B \in [\omega]^{\omega} : |\{A \in \mathcal{A} : |A \cap B| = \omega\}| \geq \omega\}$. Notice that, for a filter $\mathcal{F}$, we have that $\mathcal{F}^{+} = \mathcal{P}(\omega) \setminus \mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{F}}$ and, for an arbitrary ideal $\mathcal{I}$, $\mathcal{I}^{\perp}$ is always an ideal and $\mathcal{I} \subseteq \mathcal{I}^{\perp\perp}$. For each $X \in [\omega]^{\omega}$ and $\mathcal{A} \subseteq [\omega]^{\omega}$ we let $\mathcal{A}|_X = \{A \cap X : A \in \mathcal{A} \text{ and } |A \cap X| = \omega\}$. Observe that if $\mathcal{A}$ is an AD-family and $B \in \mathcal{A}^{*}$, then $\mathcal{A}|_B = \{A \cap B : A \in \mathcal{A} \text{ and } |A \cap B| = \omega\}$ is an AD-family on B.

Now, let $\mathcal{F}$ be a filter on ω and consider the space $\xi(\mathcal{F}) = \omega\cup\{F\}$ whose topology is defined as follows: All elements of ω are isolated and the neighborhoods of $\mathcal{F}$ are

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 54A20, 54D55: secondary 54D80, 54G20.

Key words and phrases. Fréchet-Urysohn filter, FAN-filter, Arens space, almost disjoint family, maximal almost disjoint family, Todorčević-Uzcátegui pre-order, Rudin-Keisler pre-order.

Research of the first-named author was supported by CONACYT grant no. 176202 and PAPIIT grant no. IN-101911.

of the form $\{\mathcal{F}\} \cup F$ where $F \in \mathcal{F}$. One class of spaces which has been extensively studied in Topology is the following:

A space X is called a *Fréchet-Urysohn* space (for short FU-space) if for each $x \in X$ such that $x \in cl_X A$, there is a sequence in A converging to x.

Definition 1.1. A filter $\mathcal{F}$ is called a *FU-filter* if the space $\xi(\mathcal{F})$ is Fréchet-Urysohn.

The "smallest" FU-filter is the Fréchet filter $\mathcal{F}_r$ and the countable FAN-filter is also an example of a FU-filter which does not have a countable base. By using AD-families, in the paper [4], the authors pointed out the existence of $2^{\mathfrak{c}}$ pairwise non-equivalent FU-filters. In other terms, we have that $\mathcal{F}$ is a FU-filter iff for every $A \in \mathcal{F}^+$ there is $S \in [A]^\omega$ such that $S \subseteq^* F$ for all $F \in \mathcal{F}$.

Two notions that will help us to distinguish FU-filters are the following.

Definition 1.2. Let $\mathcal{F}$ and $\mathcal{G}$ be two filters on ω.

(1) $\mathcal{F} \leq_{RK} \mathcal{G}$ if there is a function $f : \omega \to \omega$ such that $f[\mathcal{G}] = \mathcal{F}$ (i. e., $F \in \mathcal{F}$ iff $f^{-1}(F) \in \mathcal{G}$).
(2) ([11]) $\mathcal{F} \leq_{TU} \mathcal{G}$ if there are $A \in \mathcal{G}^+$, $B \in \mathcal{F}$ and a bijection $f : A \to B$ such that $f[\mathcal{G}|_B] = \mathcal{F}|_A$.

We assert that these two relations $\leq_{RK}$ and $\leq_{TU}$ are reflexive and transitive but they are not antisymmetric.

Definition 1.3. Let $\mathcal{F}$ and $\mathcal{G}$ be filters on ω.

(1) $\mathcal{F} \approx \mathcal{G}$ if there is a bijection function $f : \omega \to \omega$ such that $f[\mathcal{F}] = \mathcal{G}$.
(2) $\mathcal{F} \approx_{RK} \mathcal{G}$ if $\mathcal{F} \leq_{RK} \mathcal{G}$ and $\mathcal{G} \leq_{RK} \mathcal{F}$.

The definition introduce in (1) can be generalized as: If $A, B \in [\omega]^\omega$ and $\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G}$ are filters on A and B, respectively, then $\mathcal{F}$ and $\mathcal{G}$ are called *equivalent* if there is a bijection $f : A \to B$ such that $f[\mathcal{F}] = \mathcal{G}$. It is evident that $\mathcal{F} \approx \mathcal{G}$ implies that $\mathcal{F} \approx_{RK} \mathcal{G}$ for every pair of filters $\mathcal{F}$ and $\mathcal{G}$. However, we do not know if the inverse implication holds for the class of FU-filters:

Question 1.4. Are there two FU-filters $\mathcal{F}$ and $\mathcal{G}$ such that $\mathcal{F} \approx_{RK} \mathcal{G}$ and $\mathcal{F} \not\approx \mathcal{G}$?

By the symbol $\mathcal{F} <_{RK} \mathcal{G}$ we shall understand that $\mathcal{F} \leq_{RK} \mathcal{G}$ and $\mathcal{F} \not\approx \mathcal{G}$.

This paper is a continuation of the work done in the article [5]. The second section is devoted to recall some basic properties of the FU-filters. We give combinatorial properties which are equivalent to the RK-order and the TU-order. These equivalences will allow to construct FU-filters with some interesting properties. In the third section, we show that if $\mathcal{F} \leq \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{P}}$, then either $\mathcal{F}$ is relatively equivalent to the Fréchet filter or equivalent to $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{P}}$. The pre-orders $\leq_{RK}$ and $\leq_{TU}$ are compared in the forth section. We show that $\leq_{TU} \subseteq \leq_{RK}$ in the category of FU-filters. We also prove that if $\mathcal{A}$ is a $NMAD$-family of size $\mathfrak{c}$ which is completely separable, then $S_{\mathcal{P}} \not\leq_{TU} S_{\mathcal{A}}$ and $S_{\mathcal{P}} \leq_{RK} S_{\mathcal{A}}$. In the fifth section, we construct an RK-chain of size $\mathfrak{c}^+$ which is RK-above of each FU-filter. The sixth section is devoted to study the RK-incomparability of FU-filters. We use the α_i properties to show the RK- incomparability of certain FU-filters. Besides, we construct an infinite RK-antichain of FU-filters.

2. Fréchet-Urysohn Filters

In order to study the FU-filters and their relationships we list some useful facts.

Let $\mathcal{F}$ be a filter on ω.

(1) If $A \in [\omega]^\omega$, then $\mathcal{F} \in cl_{\xi(\mathcal{F})}A$ iff $A \in \mathcal{F}^+$.
(2) $S \to \mathcal{F}$ iff $S \in \mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{F}}^{\perp}$.
(3) $\mathcal{F}$ is a FU-filter iff $\mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{F}}^{\perp\perp} = \mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{F}}$.

It is not hard to prove that if $\emptyset \neq \mathcal{D} \subseteq [\omega]^\omega$, then

$$\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{D}} = \{F \subseteq \omega : \forall D \in \mathcal{D}(D \subseteq^* F)\}$$

is a FU-filter. By using this kind of filters and AD-families it is possible to characterize the FU-filters as follows:

Lemma 2.1. [8] *A filter $\mathcal{F}$ is a FU-filter iff there is an AD-family $\mathcal{A}$ maximal in $I_{\mathcal{F}}^{\perp}$ such that $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{A}}$.*

We can see directly from this characterization that $\mathcal{A}$ is a MAD-family iff $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{A}} = \mathcal{F}_r$. More general, if $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{A}}$ is the filter generated by an AD-family $\mathcal{A}$ and $B \to \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{A}}$, then there is $A \in \mathcal{A}$ such that $|A \cap B| = \omega$. Observe from Lemma 2.1 that for every infinite $\mathcal{D} \subseteq [\omega]^\omega$, we can find an AD-family $\mathcal{A}$ such that $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{D}} = \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{A}}$. In what follows, when we write $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{A}}$ we shall always assume that $\mathcal{A}$ is an AD-family.

Given a FU-filter $\mathcal{G}$, we say that $\mathcal{G}$ is *relatively equivalent* to the Fréchet filter iff $A \to \mathcal{G}$ and $A \in \mathcal{G}$. In particular, we have that $\mathcal{G} = \{G \cup E : G \in \mathcal{F}_r(A) \text{ and } E \subseteq \omega \setminus A\}$. If we do not require that the function f to be onto in the definition of the RK-order, then we would have that $\mathcal{F}_r(A) \leq_{RK} \mathcal{F}_r$ for every $A \in [\omega]^\omega$. For our convenience, in the definition of RK-order, we shall always require that the function involved be onto. This convenience is based on the next theorem which was proved in [5].

Theorem 2.2. *Let $\mathcal{F}$ and $\mathcal{G}$ filters such that $\mathcal{G} \neq \mathcal{F}_r$ and $\mathcal{F}$ is not relatively equivalent to the Fréchet filter. If $\mathcal{F} \leq_{RK} \mathcal{G}$, then there is a surjective function $g : \omega \to \omega$ such that $g[\mathcal{G}] = \mathcal{F}$.*

In virtue of the previous theorem, we remark that if $\mathcal{F} \leq_{RK} \mathcal{F}_r$, then $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{F}_r$. It was pointed out in [5] that every filter $\mathcal{G}$ which has a nontrivial convergent sequence satisfies that $\mathcal{F}_r \leq_{RK} \mathcal{G}$.

Next, let us describe another useful construction of FU-filters which has been very important in the construction of special FU-filters (see, for instance, the article [9]):

For every AD-family $\mathcal{A}$, we define $S_{\mathcal{A}} = \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{A})}$. In general, $S_{\mathcal{A}}$ is not a FU-filter, for instance if $\mathcal{A}$ is a MAD-family, then $S_{\mathcal{A}}$ does not have any nontrivial convergent sequence. In order that $S_{\mathcal{A}}$ be a FU-filter we need some special AD-families:

An AD-family $\mathcal{A}$ is said to be *nowhere MAD-family* ($NMAD$-family) if for every $X \in \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{A})^+$ there is $A \in \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{A})^{\perp} \cap [X]^\omega$. We remark that if $\mathcal{A}$ is a $NMAD$-family, then every infinite subfamily $\mathcal{B}$ of $\mathcal{A}$ is also a $NMAD$-family.

Theorem 2.3. *([9]) Given an AD-family $\mathcal{A}$, we have that the filter $S_{\mathcal{A}}$ is a FU-filter iff $\mathcal{A}$ is a $NMAD$-family.*

If $\mathcal{P} = \{P_n : n < \omega\} \subseteq [\omega]^\omega$ is an infinite partition of ω in infinite subsets, by Theorem 2.3, then $\mathcal{F}_\mathcal{P}$ is an FU-filter which is known as the FAN-filter. We also know that $S_\mathcal{P}$ and $\mathcal{F}_r$ are the only FU-filters with countable base. In what follows, when we write $S_\mathcal{P}$ we shall understand that $\mathcal{P}$ is an infinite partition of ω in infinite subsets. For the filters of the form $S_\mathcal{A}$ is very easy to know their characters as we shall see next.

Lemma 2.4. *If $\mathcal{A}$ is an AD-family on ω, then $\chi(S_\mathcal{A}) = |\mathcal{A}|$.*

The following combinatorial statements are equivalent to the RK-order and were proved in [5, Th. 3.4].

Theorem 2.5. *Let $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}$ be AD-families on ω. The following statements are equivalent.*

(1) $\mathcal{F}_\mathcal{A} \leq_{RK} \mathcal{F}_\mathcal{B}$ *via the function* $f : \omega \to \omega$.
(2) (a) $\forall F \in \mathcal{F}_\mathcal{A}(f^{-1}(F) \in \mathcal{F}_\mathcal{B})$, *and*
    (b) $\forall G \in \mathcal{F}_\mathcal{B}(f[G] \in \mathcal{F}_\mathcal{A})$.
(3) (a) $\forall n < \omega \forall B \in \mathcal{B}(|f^{-1}(n) \cap B| < \omega)$,
    (b) $\forall B \in \mathcal{B} \forall C \in \mathcal{A}^\perp(|f[B] \cap C| < \omega)$, *and*
    (c) $\forall S \in C(\mathcal{A}) \exists B \in \mathcal{B}(|f^{-1}(S) \cap B| = \omega)$.

The next result can be obtained by a slight modification of the proof of the previous theorem.

Theorem 2.6. *Let $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}$ be $NMAD$-families on ω. The following statements are equivalent.*

(1) $S_\mathcal{A} \leq_{RK} S_\mathcal{B}$ *via the function* $f : \omega \to \omega$.
(2) (a) $\forall F \in S_\mathcal{A}(f^{-1}(F) \in S_\mathcal{B})$, *and*
    (b) $\forall G \in S_\mathcal{B}(f[G] \in S_\mathcal{A})$.
(3) (a) $\forall I \in \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{A})(f^{-1}(I) \in \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{B}))$, *and*
    (b) $\forall M \in \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{A})^\perp \cap [\omega]^\omega \exists R \in \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{B})^\perp \cap [\omega]^\omega(|f^{-1}(M) \cap R| = \omega)$.

the last two theorems will be very useful in the construction of spacial filters.

3. FAN-filter

In what follows, $\mathcal{P}$ will stand for an infinite partition of ω in infinite subsets. In the paper [5], we proved that the FAN-filter $\mathcal{F}_\mathcal{P}$ and the $S_\mathcal{P}$ filter are not RK-comparable. We know, by lemma 2.4, that the only filters which are RK-predecessors of $S_\mathcal{P}$ are either itself or a filter that is relatively equivalent to the Fréchet filter. All these remarks lead us to ask in [5, Q. 5.12] what are the RK-predecessors of the FAN-filter ?:

Question. Is there an AD-family $\mathcal{A}$ such that $\mathcal{F}_r <_{RK} \mathcal{F}_\mathcal{A} <_{RK} \mathcal{F}_\mathcal{P}$?

We shall respond this question in the next theorem.

Lemma 3.1. *Let $\mathcal{A}$ be an AD-family on ω and $f : \omega \to \omega$ be a surjective function such that the restriction $f|_\mathcal{A}$ is finite-to-one for each $A \in \mathcal{A}$. If $\mathcal{D}_f := \{f[A] : A \in \mathcal{A}\}$, then $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{D}_f} \leq_{RK} \mathcal{F}_A$ via f.*

Proof. We have to prove that $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{D}_f} = f[\mathcal{F}_\mathcal{A}]$. Let $F \in \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{D}_f}$ and assume that $F \notin f[\mathcal{F}_\mathcal{A}]$. Then there is $A \in \mathcal{A}$ such that $A \setminus f^{-1}(F)$ is infinite. Then, we have that $f[A \setminus f^{-1}(F)]$ is infinite and $f[A \setminus f^{-1}(F)] \to \mathcal{F}_{D_f}$, but $f[A \setminus f^{-1}(F)] \cap F = \emptyset$

which is impossible. Thus $F \in f[\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{A}}]$. So, we obtain that $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{D}_f} \subseteq f[\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{A}}]$. Now fix $H \in f[\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{A}}]$ and suppose that $H \notin \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{D}_f}$. Then there is $A \in \mathcal{A}$ such that $f[A] \setminus H$ is infinite. We know that $A \subseteq^* f^{-1}(H)$ which implies that $f[A] \subseteq^* H$, but this is a contradiction. Thus $H \in \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{D}_f}$. This proves that $f[\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{A}}] \subseteq \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{D}_f}$. Therefore, $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{D}_f} = f[\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{A}}]$ and hence $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{D}_f} \leq_{RK} \mathcal{F}_A$ via the function f. □

Lemma 3.2. *If $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{A}} \leq_{RK} \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{B}}$ via the function f, then $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{D}_f} = \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{A}}$.*

Proof. Observe that for each $B \in \mathcal{B}$, $f[B] \subseteq^* F$ for all $F \in \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{A}}$. Hence, we have that $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{A}} \subseteq \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{D}_f}$. Now let $G \in \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{D}_f}$ and suppose that $G \notin \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{A}}$. Then we can find $A \in \mathcal{A}$ such that $|A \setminus G| = \omega$. Since $A \setminus G \to \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{A}}$, by Theorem 2.5, there is $B \in \mathcal{B}$ such that $B \cap (f^{-1}(A) \setminus f^{-1}(G))$ is infinite, but this contradicts the fact $B \subseteq^* f^{-1}(G)$. Thus, we must have that $G \in \mathcal{F}_A$. Therefore, $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{D}_f} = \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{A}}$. □

Theorem 3.3. *If $\mathcal{F} \leq_{RK} \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{P}}$, then either $\mathcal{F}$ is relatively equivalent to the Fréchet filter or equivalent to $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{P}}$.*

Proof. It is known that $\mathcal{F}$ is an FU-filter (for a proof see [5]). Let $f : \omega \to \omega$ be a function such that $f[\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{P}}] = \mathcal{F}$ and $\mathcal{P} = \{P_n : n < \omega\}$. Notice that $\mathcal{D}_f = \{f[P_n] : n < \omega\}$ is a cover of ω and $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{D}_f} = \mathcal{F}$ by the previous lemma. First assume that there is $n < \omega$ such that $|f[P_m] \setminus \left(\bigcup_{i<n} f[P_i]\right)| < \omega$ for all $n < m < \omega$. It is clearly that $\bigcup_{i<n_k} f[P_i] = A \in \mathcal{F}$ and since $A \to \mathcal{F}$, we also have that $\mathcal{F}$ is relatively equivalent to the Fréchet filter. Now, set $Q_0 = f[P_0]$ and inductively define a pairwise disjoint family $\mathcal{Q} = \{Q_k : k < \omega\}$ of infinite subsets of ω, and a strictly increasing sequence $(n_k)_{k<\omega}$ in ω so that $n_0 = 0$, $Q_k = f[P_{n_k}] \setminus \left(\bigcup_{i<n_{k-1}} Q_i\right)$ is infinite and n_k is the smallest with this property. Since each element of $\mathcal{Q}$ is contained in an element of $\mathcal{D}_f$, we have that $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{D}_f} \subseteq \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{Q}}$. Let $F \in \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{Q}}$ and fix $P_n \in \mathcal{P}$. Let $k = min\{i < \omega : n \leq n_i < \omega\}$. Then, by construction, we obtain that $f[P_n] \subseteq^* \bigcup_{i\leq n_k} Q_i \subseteq^* F$. Hence, $F \in \mathcal{F}$. Therefore, $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{Q}}$. □

To finish this section we pose the following question.

Question 3.4. Let $\mathcal{F}$ be a FU-filter non-equivalent to the Fréchet filter. If $\mathcal{G} \leq_{RK} \mathcal{F}$ implies that either $\mathcal{G}$ is relatively equivalent to the Fréchet filter or equivalent to $\mathcal{G}$, must $\mathcal{F}$ be equivalent to the FAN-filter ?

4. Todorčević-Uzcátegui pre-order

In this section, we shall compare the FU-filters by using the pre-order which has been introduced in Definition 1.2. The first goal is to compare this pre-order with the RK-order. To do that we reformulate the definition of the TU-order to make it a little bite easier to handle. Before this reformulation we need to prove a well-known property of certain filters.

Lemma 4.1. *Let $\mathcal{F}$ be a filter non-relatively equivalent to the Fréchet filter. Then for every $A \in \mathcal{F} \setminus \mathcal{F}_r$ there is a bijection $f : A \to \omega$ such that $f[\mathcal{F}|_A] = \mathcal{F}$. In particular, $\mathcal{F} \approx \mathcal{F}|_A$ for all $A \in \mathcal{F} \setminus \mathcal{F}_r$.*

Proof. Let $A \in \mathcal{F} \setminus \mathcal{F}_r$. Since $\mathcal{F}$ is not relatively equivalent to the Fréchet filter there is $B \in \mathcal{F} \cap [A]^\omega$ such that $A \setminus B \in [A]^\omega$. Define $f : A \to \omega$ so that $f|_B$ is the identity on B and $f[A \setminus B] = \omega \setminus B$ as a bijection. Let $F \in \mathcal{F}$. Then we have that

$$f^{-1}(F) = f^{-1}(F \cap B) \cup f^{-1}(F \setminus B) = (F \cap B) \cup f^{-1}(F \setminus B).$$

Since $F \cap B \in \mathcal{F}|_A$, we must have that $f^{-1}(F) \in \mathcal{F}|_A$. This shows that $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \mathcal{F}|_A$. Now, fix $G \in \mathcal{F}|_A$. Notice that

$$f[G] = f[G \cap B] \cup f[G \setminus B] = (G \cap B) \cup f[G \setminus B].$$

As $G \in \mathcal{F}|_A$, there is $H \in \mathcal{F}$ such that $G = H \cap A$ and since that $G \cap B = H \cap A \cap B \in \mathcal{F}$, then $f[G] \in \mathcal{F}$. Thus, $\mathcal{F}|_A \subseteq \mathcal{F}$. Therefore, $f[\mathcal{F}|_A] = \mathcal{F}$. □

The next corollary conveniently reformulates the definition of the TU-order.

Corollary 4.2. *Let $\mathcal{F}$ and $\mathcal{G}$ two filters. Then, $\mathcal{F} \leq_{TU} \mathcal{G}$ iff either*

(1) *$\mathcal{F}$ is a relatively equivalent to the Fréchet filter, or*
(2) *there are $A \in \mathcal{G}^+$ and a bijection $f : A \to \omega$ such that $f[\mathcal{G}|_A] = \mathcal{F}$.*

In virtue of the previous corollary, we shall always assume that the element of the filter witnessing being a TU-predecessor is ω. However, the positive element that witnesses being a TU-successor cannot be replace by an element of the FU-filter as in the TU-order: that is, if we use only members of the filters in the TU-order we obtain the RK-order as it is shown in the next corollary.

Corollary 4.3. *Let $\mathcal{F}$ and $\mathcal{G}$ be two filters non-relatively equivalent to the Fréchet filter. Then $\mathcal{F} \leq_{RK} \mathcal{G}$ iff for each $A \in \mathcal{G} \setminus \mathcal{F}_r$ and $B \in \mathcal{F} \setminus \mathcal{F}_r$ there is a surjection $f : A \to B$ such that $f[\mathcal{G}|_A] = \mathcal{F}|_B$.*

We will see in the next theorem that the TU-order implies the RK-order whenever the TU-predecessor lies in the category of the FU-filters.

Let us remark that if $A \in \mathcal{G}^+ \setminus \mathcal{G}$, then $\omega \setminus A \in \mathcal{G}^+ \setminus \mathcal{G}$ and

$$\mathcal{G} = \mathcal{G}|_A \oplus \mathcal{G}|_{\omega \setminus A} := \{F \cup E : F \in \mathcal{G}|_A \text{ and } E \in \mathcal{G}|_{\omega \setminus A}\}.$$

Theorem 4.4. *Let $\mathcal{F}$ and $\mathcal{G}$ two filters such that $C(\mathcal{F}) \neq \emptyset$. If $\mathcal{F} \leq_{TU} \mathcal{G}$, then $\mathcal{F} \leq_{RK} \mathcal{G}$.*

Proof. Suppose that $A \in \mathcal{G}^+$ and $f : A \to \omega$ witnesses that $f[\mathcal{G}|_A] = \mathcal{F}$. Fix $M \in C(\mathcal{F})$. Define $g : \omega \to \omega$ so that $g|_A = f$ and $g[\omega \setminus A] = M$ as a bijection. Let $F \in \mathcal{F}$. Since every element of M has exactly two pre-images, we have that $g^{-1}(F) = f^{-1}(F) \bigcup g^{-1}(F \cap M)$. Clearly $f^{-1}(F) \in \mathcal{G}|_A$ and since $M \subseteq^* F$, then $g^{-1}(F \cap M) \cap (\omega \setminus A) \in \mathcal{F}_r(\omega \setminus A)$. By the above remark, we obtain that $g^{-1}(F) \in \mathcal{G}$. So $\mathcal{F} \subseteq g[\mathcal{G}]$. Now fix $G \in \mathcal{G}$. Then we have that

$$g[G] = g[G \cap A] \cup g[G \setminus A] = f[G \cap A] \cup g[G \setminus A].$$

Since $f[G \cap A] \in \mathcal{F}$, $g[G] \in \mathcal{F}$. Thus, $g[\mathcal{G}] \subseteq \mathcal{F}$. This proves that $g[\mathcal{G}] = \mathcal{F}$. Therefore, $\mathcal{F} \leq_{RK} \mathcal{G}$. □

Corollary 4.5. *Let $\mathcal{F}$ and $\mathcal{G}$ two FU-filters. If $\mathcal{F} \leq_{TU} \mathcal{G}$, then $\mathcal{F} \leq_{RK} \mathcal{G}$.*

In a general context, one may ask what about the implications $\leq_{RK} \Rightarrow \leq_{TU}$ and $\leq_{TU} \Rightarrow \leq_{RK}$ without any restrictions on the filters ? We just have seen that the TU-order implies the RK-order on the class of FU-filters, which is also true for every pair of ultrafilters $\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V}$ (i. e., $\mathcal{U} \leq_{TU} \mathcal{V} \Rightarrow \mathcal{U} \leq_{RK} \mathcal{V}$). Let us see, in the next examples, that both implications could fail in general:

The *Arens filter* $\mathcal{F}_a$ is defined by an infinite partition $\mathcal{P} = \{P_n : n < \omega\}$ of ω and the Fréchet filter on each P_n as follows:

$$\mathcal{F}_a := \{F \subseteq \omega : \{n < \omega : P_n \cap P \in \mathcal{F}_r(P_n)\} \in \mathcal{F}_r\}.$$

The filter $\mathcal{F}_a$ is sequential but it is not an FU-filter. Besides, we know that the filter $\mathcal{F}_a|_A$ is a copy of $\mathcal{F}_a$ for every $A \in \mathcal{F}_a^+$. Thus if $\mathcal{F} \leq_{TU} \mathcal{F}_a$, then $\mathcal{F} \approx \mathcal{F}_a$. However, the Fréchet filter is a RK-predecessor of the Arens filter via the function $f : \omega \to \omega$, defined by $f[P_n] = n$ for each $n < \omega$. This example shows that the implication $\mathcal{F} \leq_{RK} \mathcal{G} \Rightarrow \mathcal{F} \leq_{TU} \mathcal{G}$ does not hold in general. Now, we describe an example to show that the implication $\mathcal{F} \leq_{TU} \mathcal{G} \Rightarrow \mathcal{F} \leq_{RK} \mathcal{G}$ could be false. Choose $M, N \in [\omega]^\omega$ so that $M \cap N = \emptyset$ and $M \cup N = \omega$. We know that $\mathcal{F}_a \leq_{TU} \mathcal{F}_a(M) \oplus \mathcal{G} = \{F \cup G : F \in \mathcal{F}_a(M) \text{ and } G \in \mathcal{G}\}$, where $\mathcal{F}_a(M)$ is a copy of the Arens filter on M and $\mathcal{G}$ is a filter on N. Let $\mathcal{G}$ be an arbitrary FU-filter and suppose that $\mathcal{F}_a \leq_{RK} \mathcal{F}_a \oplus \mathcal{G}$ via the function f. Since $\mathcal{G}$ is an FU-filter, there is $R \in [N]^\omega$ such that $R \to \mathcal{F}_a(M) \oplus \mathcal{G}$ and then $f[R] \to \mathcal{F}_a$, but $\mathcal{F}_a$ does not have any nontrivial convergent sequence. This shows that the implication $\mathcal{F} \leq_{TU} \mathcal{G} \Rightarrow \mathcal{F} \leq_{RK} \mathcal{G}$ could fail in general.

Next, we will use FU-filters of the form $S_\mathcal{A}$ to show that $\leq_{RK} \not\subseteq \leq_{TU}$. Before that we need to prove a theorem.

Theorem 4.6. *Let $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}$ be $NMAD$-families such that $S_\mathcal{A} \leq_{RK} S_\mathcal{B}$ via a function $f : \omega \to \omega$ which satisfies that $|f^{-1}(n)| = \omega$ for all $n < \omega$. If $\mathcal{C}$ is a $NMAD$ family such that $\mathcal{B} \subseteq \mathcal{C}$, then $S_\mathcal{A} \leq_{RK} S_\mathcal{C}$ via the function f.*

Proof. In order to show that $f[S_\mathcal{C}] = S_\mathcal{A}$, we use clause (3) of Theorem 2.6. By using the statement $(3)(a)$, we know that $f^{-1}(n) \in \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{B})$ for all $n < \omega$. Hence, for each $n < \omega$, we have that $|f^{-1}(n) \cap C| < \omega$ for every $C \in \mathcal{C} \setminus \mathcal{B}$. Let $M \in \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{A})^\perp$. Notice that the containment $f[S_\mathcal{B}] \subseteq S_\mathcal{A}$ implies that there is $N \in \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{B})^\perp$ such that $|f^{-1}(M) \cap N| = \omega$.Thus, we obtain that $f^{-1}(M) \in S_\mathcal{C}^+ = \mathcal{P}(\omega) \setminus \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{C})$. There are two cases to be consider. The first one is when $f^{-1}(M) = M_0 \cup M_1$ where $M_0 \in \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{C})$ and $M_1 \in \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{C})^\perp \cap [\omega]^\omega$. This case is clearly done since M_1 does the job. For the second one assume that $f^{-1}(M) \in \mathcal{C}^*$. Since $\mathcal{C}$ is a $NMAD$-family, then there is $N \in \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{C})^\perp \cap [\omega]^\omega$ such that $|f^{-1}(M) \cap N| = \omega$. Thus, $f[S_\mathcal{C}] = S_\mathcal{A}$. Therefore, we conclude that $S_\mathcal{A} \leq_{RK} S_\mathcal{C}$ via the function f. □

Let $\mathcal{A}$ be an AD family on ω. For each $A \in \mathcal{A}$ choose $E_A \in [\omega]^{<\omega}$ and consider one of the sets either $A' = A \cup E_A$ or $A' = A \setminus E_A$. It is not difficult to show that $S_\mathcal{A} = S_{\mathcal{A}'}$ where $\mathcal{A}' = \{A' : A \in \mathcal{A}\}$. For our convenience, without lose of generality, we shall assume that each AD-family $\mathcal{A}$ always contains a partition $\{A_n : n < \omega\} \subseteq \mathcal{A}$ of ω in infinite subsets. We show next that $S_\mathcal{P}$ is an RK-minimal filter in the realm of the filters of the form $S_\mathcal{A}$ where $\mathcal{A}$ is a $NMAD$-family.

Corollary 4.7. *$S_\mathcal{P} \leq_{RK} S_\mathcal{A}$ for every $NMAD$-family $\mathcal{A}$.*

Proof. Let $\mathcal{A}$ be an AD-family on ω such that $\mathcal{A}' = \{A_n : n < \omega\} \subseteq \mathcal{A}$ is a partition of ω. Enumerate $\mathcal{P}$ as $\{P_n : n < \omega\}$ and we define $f : \omega \to \omega$ so that $f[A_n] = P_n$ and $|f^{-1}(n)|$ is infinite for each $n < \omega$. It is straightforward to prove that $S_\mathcal{P} \leq_{RK} S_{\mathcal{A}'}$ via f. Therefore, from Theorem 4.6 we deduce that $S_\mathcal{P} \leq_{RK} S_\mathcal{A}$ via the function f. □

The answer to the following question will be very useful to understand the filter $S_\mathcal{A}$.

Question 4.8. Is true that $S_\mathcal{P} \leq_{RK} S_\mathcal{A}$ for every AD-family $\mathcal{A}$?

We recall that an AD-family is said to be *completely separable* if for every $M \in \mathcal{B}^*$, there is $B \in \mathcal{B}$ such that $B \subseteq M$. In the paper [9], P. Simon showed, in ZFC, the existence of a completely separable $NMAD$-family of size $\mathfrak{c}$.

Corollary 4.9. *If $\mathcal{A}$ is a $NMAD$-family of size $\mathfrak{c}$ which is completely separable, then $S_{\mathcal{P}} \not\leq_{TU} S_{\mathcal{A}}$ and $S_{\mathcal{P}} \leq_{RK} S_{\mathcal{A}}$.*

Proof. Let $\mathcal{A}$ be a completely separable $NMAD$-family of size $\mathfrak{c}$. In the article [9], the author showed that this family satisfies that $|\{A \in \mathcal{A} : |M \cap A| = \omega\}| = \mathfrak{c}$ for all $M \in \mathcal{A}^*$. If $M \in S^+_{\mathcal{A}}$ and $|\{A \in \mathcal{A} : |M \cap A| = \omega\}| < \omega$, then $S_{\mathcal{A}}|_M$ is a relatively equivalent to the Fréchet filter. If $M \in \mathcal{A}^*$, then $S_{\mathcal{A}}|_M$ has character equal to $\mathfrak{c}$. Thus, $S_{\mathcal{A}}$ has not a copy of $S_{\mathcal{P}}$. Therefore, $S_{\mathcal{P}} \not\leq_{TU} S_{\mathcal{A}}$. On the other hand, by Corollary 4.7, we have that $S_{\mathcal{P}} \leq_{RK} S_{\mathcal{A}}$. □

The behavior of the filters of the form $S_{\mathcal{A}}$, where $\mathcal{A}$ is completely separable, under the RK-order is not well-know yet. For instance, we do not the answer to the following question.

Question 4.10. Are there two completely separable $NMAD$-families $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}$ such that their filters $S_{\mathcal{A}}$ and $S_{\mathcal{B}}$ are RK-incomparable ?

In the last section, we will construct two $NMAD$-families of size $\mathfrak{c}$ whose respective filters are RK-incomparable.

5. Chains of FU-filters in the RK-order and TU-order.

First, we shall describe an operation of filters that preserves the FU-property and produces RK-successors:

Let I be a set, $\mathcal{F}$ a (not necessarily free) filter on I and $\mathcal{A} = \{A_i : i \in I\}$ an AD-family. For each $i \in I$, choose a free filter $\mathcal{F}_i$ on the set A_i. Then we define

$$\sum_{\mathcal{F}} \mathcal{F}_i := \{F \subseteq \omega : \{i \in I : F \cap A_i \in \mathcal{F}_i\} \in \mathcal{F}\}$$

and

$$\prod_{i \in I} \mathcal{F}_i := \{F \subseteq \omega : \forall i \in I (F \cap A_i \in \mathcal{F}_i)\}.$$

Notice that if the filter on I is the trivial filter $\{I\}$, then

$$\prod_{i \in I} \mathcal{F}_i := \sum_{\{I\}} \mathcal{F}_i.$$

The filter $\prod_{i \in I} \mathcal{F}_i$ is referred as the product of the filters $\{F_i : i \in I\}$. Several interesting properties of this operation of filters are contained in [5]. It is evident that $\sum_{\mathcal{F}} \mathcal{F}_i$ is always a free filter on ω and that $F \in (\prod_{i \in I} \mathcal{F}_i)^+$ iff there is $i \in I$ such that $F \in \mathcal{F}_i^+$. Hence, we deduce that $\prod_{i \in I} \mathcal{F}_i$ is a FU-filter iff $\mathcal{F}_i$ is a FU-filter for all $i \in I$. We remark that $\sum_{\mathcal{F}} \mathcal{F}_i$ is not, in general, an FU-filter: for instance the Arens filter $\mathcal{F}_a$. In this context, the FAN-filter is the filter $\prod_{n<\omega} \mathcal{F}_r(P_n)$ where $\{P_n : n < \omega\}$ is a partition of ω in infinite subsets. The product of finitely many filters $\mathcal{F}_0, ..., \mathcal{F}_n$ will be denote by $\mathcal{F}_0 \oplus \mathcal{F}_1 \oplus ..... \oplus \mathcal{F}_n$. We point out that if $\mathcal{A} = \{A_i : i \in I\}$ is an AD-family and $\mathcal{A}_i$ is an AD-family on A_i, for each $i \in I$, then

$$\prod_{i \in I} \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{A}_i} = \mathcal{F}_{\bigcup_{i \in I} \mathcal{A}_i}.$$

To construct RK-up-directed chains we need the following lemma from [5, 4.2].

Lemma 5.1. *Let $A \in [\omega]^\omega$. Suppose that $\mathcal{A} = \{A_i : i \in I\} \cup \{A\}$ is an AD-family and $\mathcal{A}_i$ is an AD-family on ω, for each $i \in I$. If $f_i : \omega \to A_i$ is a bijection, for every $i \in I$ and, $\mathcal{B}$ is an AD-family on A, then $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{A}_j} \leq_{RK} \mathcal{F}_{\bigcup_{i\in I} f_i[\mathcal{A}_i]\cup\mathcal{B}}$ for all $j \in I$.*

We remark that $\leq_{RK}$ can be replaced by $\leq_{TU}$ in the previous Lemma.

Theorem 5.2. *If $\{\mathcal{A}_\xi : \xi < \mathfrak{c}\}$ is a collection of AD-families, then there is an AD-family $\mathcal{C}$ such that $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{A}_\xi} <_{RK} \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{C}}$ for all $\xi < \mathfrak{c}$.*

Proof. Fix $A \in [\omega]^\omega$ so that $\omega \setminus A$ is infinite and let $\{A_\xi : \xi < \mathfrak{c}\}$ be an AD-family on $\omega \setminus A$. For each $\xi < \mathfrak{c}$ choose a bijection $f_\xi : \omega \to A_\xi$. By the previous lemma we obtain that $\mathcal{F}_{A_\xi} \leq_{RK} \mathcal{F}_{\cup_{\xi<\mathfrak{c}} f[A_\xi]\cup\mathcal{B}}$ for all $\xi < \mathfrak{c}$ and for every AD-family $\mathcal{B}$ on A. We know that there are $2^{\mathfrak{c}}$ pairwise distinct AD-families on A, and since every filter $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{A}_\xi}$ has at most $\mathfrak{c}$-many RK-predecessors, we can find an AD-family $\mathcal{B}$ such that $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{B}} \not\leq_{RK} \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{A}_\xi}$ for all $\xi < \mathfrak{c}$. Therefore, $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{A}_\xi} <_{RK} \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{C}}$ for all $\xi < \mathfrak{c}$, where $\mathcal{C} = \bigcup_{\xi<\mathfrak{c}} f[A_\xi] \cup \mathcal{B}$. □

Corollary 5.3. *There is a strictly increasing RK-chain of FU-filters of size $\mathfrak{c}^+$ RK-above every FU-filter.*

6. RK-Incomparability of FU-filters

In this section, we construct an RK-antichain consisting of FU-filters. The authors of [11] have proved the existence of a TU-antichain of size $\mathfrak{c}^+$ consisting of FU-filters.

The next notions introduced by A. V. Arhangel'skii in [1] will help us to distinguish several FU-filters.

Definition 6.1. Let X be an space and $x \in X$. A *sheaf* of x is a family of sequences $\{C_n : n < \omega\}$ in X converging to x. We say that x is an *α_i-point* (for each $i = 1, 2, 3, 4$) if for every sheaf $\{C_n : n < \omega\}$ of x there is a sequence B converging to x such that:

(α_1) $C_n \subseteq^* B$, for all $n < \omega$.
(α_2) $C_n \subseteq^* B$, for all $n < \omega$.
(α_3) $|C_n \cap B| = \omega$, for infinitely many $n < \omega$.
(α_4) $C_n \cap B \neq \emptyset$, for infinitely many $n < \omega$.

The space X is called *α_i-space* if every point in X is an α_i-point. In particular, a filter $\mathcal{F}$ is an *α_i-filter* if its nonisolated point is an α_i point in the space $\xi(\mathcal{F})$, for every $i = 1, 2, 3, 4$.

It is straightforward to prove the following implications:

$$first\ countability \Rightarrow \alpha_1 \Rightarrow \alpha_2 \Rightarrow \alpha_3 \Rightarrow \alpha_4.$$

The FAN-filter is a canonical example of a FU-filter which is not an α_4-filter; indeed, it is well-know that a space is not an α_4-space iff the space contains a copy of FAN-space (for a prove see [10]). In the article [9], P. Simon constructed a completely separable $NMAD$-family $\mathcal{A}$ of size $\mathfrak{c}$ such that $S_{\mathcal{A}}$ is an α_4-filter which is not an α_3-filter. For this AD-family $\mathcal{A}$, it is easy to show that $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{A}}$ is also an α_4-filter that is not an α_3-filter.

In the following, we shall use a standard well-known technic to construct FU-filters by using the Cantor tree $2^{<\omega} = \bigcup_{n<\omega} 2^n$:

For each $x \in 2^\omega$ we define $A_x = \{x|n : n < \omega\} \subseteq 2^{<\omega}$. For every infinite $X \subseteq 2^\omega$ we have that $\mathcal{A}_X = \{A_x : x \in X\}$ is an $NMAD$-family on $2^{<\omega}$. By identifying $2^{<\omega}$ with ω, the family $\mathcal{A}_X$ can be considered as a family of subsets of ω. P. Nyikos ([6]) proved that $S_{\mathcal{A}_X}$ is an α_3-filter for all infinite $X \subseteq 2^\omega$. He also showed that there is $Z \subseteq 2^\omega$ for which $S_{\mathcal{A}_Z}$ is an α_2-filter, but in general this assertion could fail; for instance, $S_{\mathcal{A}_{2^\omega}}$ is not an α_2-filter. All examples of FU-filters given above lie in ZFC. Nyikos have proved in [7], under the assumption $\omega_1 = \mathfrak{b}$, that there is an FU-space that is α_2-space but it fails to be α_1-space. In the same paper, it was proved that if $\omega_1 < \mathfrak{b}$, then there is an FU-space which is α_1 but it is not a first countable space. Years later, A. Dow ([2]) proved that the implication "$\alpha_2 \Rightarrow \alpha_1$" holds inside of the Lavers Model and together with J. Steprāns [3] constructed a model of ZFC in which every α_1-space is a first countable space. The existence of an α_2-space which is not an α_1-space, and the existence of an α_1-space which is not an first countable space are still open problems in ZFC.

Now let us prove that the properties α_2, α_3 and α_4 are preserved by the RK-order down-directed.

Theorem 6.2. *Let $\mathcal{F}_\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{F}_\mathcal{B}$ be two FU-filters. If $\mathcal{F}_\mathcal{B}$ is an α_i-filter and $\mathcal{F}_\mathcal{A} \leq_{RK} \mathcal{F}_\mathcal{B}$, then $\mathcal{F}_\mathcal{A}$ is also an α_i-filter, for each $i = 2, 3, 4$.*

Proof. We only give a proof for the α_2-property since the procedure for α_3 and α_4 is exactly the same. Let $\{C_n : n < \omega\} \subset C(\mathcal{F}_\mathcal{A})$ be a sheaf of $\mathcal{F}_\mathcal{A}$ and $f : \omega \to \omega$ such that $f[\mathcal{F}_\mathcal{B}] = \mathcal{F}_\mathcal{A}$. By Theorem 2.5, we can find $B_n \in \mathcal{B}$ such that $|f^{-1}(C_n) \cap B_n| = \omega$ for every $n < \omega$. Notice that $\{f^{-1}(C_n) \cap B_n : n < \omega\}$ is a sheaf of $\mathcal{F}_\mathcal{B}$. Since $\mathcal{F}_\mathcal{B}$ is an α_2-filter, then there is a sequence B converging to $\mathcal{F}_\mathcal{B}$ such that $|B \cap (f^{-1}(C_n) \cap B_n)| = \omega$ for all $n < \omega$. We remark that $f[B] \to \mathcal{F}_\mathcal{A}$. Fix $n < \omega$. Let us prove that $|f[B] \cap C_n| = \omega$. Indeed, we have that

$$f[B \cap (f^{-1}(C_n) \cap B_n)] \subseteq f[B] \cap (C_n \cap f[B_n]) \subseteq f[B] \cap C_n.$$

Since $B \cap (f^{-1}(C_n) \cap B_n) \to \mathcal{F}_\mathcal{B}$, then $|f[B \cap (f^{-1}(C_n) \cap B_n)]| = \omega$ and so $|f[B] \cap C_n| = \omega$. Therefore, $\mathcal{F}_\mathcal{A}$ is an α_2-filter. □

For an arbitrary $NMAD$-family $\mathcal{A}$, we know that the filter $\mathcal{F}_\mathcal{A}$ cannot be an α_3-filter. Thus we obtain the following corollary.

Corollary 6.3. *$S_\mathcal{P}$ is not an RK-successor of $\mathcal{F}_\mathcal{A}$ for any $NMAD$-family $\mathcal{A}$.*

The next corollary is consequence a from Corollary 6.3 and Corollary 5.6 from [5].

Corollary 6.4. *$S_\mathcal{P}$ is RK-incomparable with every filter $\mathcal{F}_\mathcal{A}$ such that $|\mathcal{A}| < \mathfrak{b}$.*

By using the Corollary 4.5, Theorem 6.2 and some facts quoted above we obtain the next result.

Corollary 6.5. *$\mathcal{F}_\mathcal{P} \leq_{RK} \mathcal{F}$ iff $\mathcal{F}_\mathcal{P} \leq_{TU} \mathcal{F}$.*

Now we show that some of the FU-filters already described above are RK-incomparable.

Theorem 6.6. *Let $\mathcal{A}$ be a $NMAD$-family completely separable of size $\mathfrak{c}$. Then there is a set $X \subseteq 2^\omega$ such that $\mathcal{F}_\mathcal{P}$, $S_\mathcal{A}$ and $S_{\mathcal{A}_X}$ form an RK-antichain.*

Proof. Notice that there are $2^{\mathfrak{c}}$ pairwise non-homeomorphic filters of the form $S_{\mathcal{A}_X}$ whit $|X| = \mathfrak{c}$. We can choose one of them satisfying $S_{\mathcal{A}_X} \not\leq_{RK} S_{\mathcal{A}}$. We know that $S_{\mathcal{A}_X}$ is an α_3-filter, $S_{\mathcal{A}}$ is an α_4-filter which is not an α_3-filter and the FAN-filter $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{P}}$ is not an α_4-filter. Hence, by Theorem 6.2, we obtain that

$$\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{P}} \not\leq_{RK} S_{\mathcal{B}} \not\leq_{RK} S_{\mathcal{A}_X} \text{ and } \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{P}} \not\leq_{RK} S_{\mathcal{A}_X}.$$

According to Theorem 3.3, we have that $S_{\mathcal{A}_X} \not\leq_{RK} \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{P}}$ and $S_{\mathcal{A}} \not\leq_{RK} \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{P}}$. Therefore, $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{P}}$, $S_{\mathcal{A}}$ and $S_{\mathcal{A}_X}$ are pairwise RK-incomparable. □

Our next task is the construction of an infinite RK-antichain consisting of FU-filters. Such filters will be the form $S_{\mathcal{A}_X}$ for suitable sets $X \subseteq 2^\omega$. For our purposes it is important to remark the next characterization of the convergent sequences in $S_{\mathcal{A}_X}$:

Remark. For $X \in 2^\omega$ and $N \in [2^{<\omega}]^\omega$, the following statements are equivalents:

(1) $N \to S_{\mathcal{A}_X}$.
(2) $N \in \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{A}_X)^\perp$.
(3) For all $K \in [N]^\omega$ there is either:
   (a) $x \in 2^\omega \setminus X$ such that $|A_x \cap K| = \omega$ or
   (b) an infinite antichain M such that $|M \cap K| = \omega$.

Thus, we may consider only branches and antichains of $2^{<\omega}$. The following equivalence is a consequence of the Theorem 2.6 and our last remark.

Lemma 6.7. *Let $X_0, X_1 \subseteq 2^\omega$ and $f : 2^\omega \to 2^\omega$ a surjection. Then, $f[S_{\mathcal{A}_{X_1}}] \neq S_{\mathcal{A}_{X_0}}$ iff one of the following conditions is satisfied:*

(1) *There is $x \in 2^\omega \setminus X_1$ such that $f[A_x] \nrightarrow S_{\mathcal{A}_{X_0}}$.*
(2) *There is an infinite antichain M such that $f[M] \nrightarrow S_{\mathcal{A}_{X_0}}$.*
(3) *There is $y \in 2^\omega \setminus X_0$ such that $f^{-1}(A_y) \in \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{A}_{X_1})$.*
(4) *There is an infinite antichain M such that $f^{-1}(M) \in \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{A}_{X_1})$.*

We would like to point out that clauses (1) and (2) imply $S_{\mathcal{A}_{X_0}} \not\subseteq f[S_{\mathcal{A}_{X_1}}]$, and conditions (3) and (4) imply $f[S_{\mathcal{A}_{X_1}}] \not\subseteq S_{\mathcal{A}_{X_0}}$. If there is an infinite antichain M such that $|f[M]| < \omega$, then we may avoid this kind of functions, since f cannot be a witness of the RK-comparability for any pair of FU-filters. Thus, in what follows, we shall always assume that $f|_M$ is finite-to-one at every antichain M.

Let us show in the next lemma that we can always extend the sets X_0 and X_1 in order to have witnesses for the RK-incomparability of their respective FU-filters of the extensions.

Lemma 6.8. *Let X_0 and X_1 be nonempty subsets of 2^ω such that $|2^\omega \setminus (X_0 \cup X_1)| \geq \omega$ and $f : 2^{<\omega} \to 2^{<\omega}$ a surjection such that $f|_M$ is finite-to-one for every infinite antichain M. Then, there are $X_0', X_1', Y_0, Y_1 \subseteq 2^\omega$ such that $X_0 \subsetneq X_0'$, $0 < |X_0' \setminus X_0| < \omega$, $X_1 \subsetneq X_1'$, $0 < |X_1' \setminus X_1| < \omega$, $0 < |Y_0|, |Y_1| < \omega$, $X_0' \cap Y_0 = \emptyset = X_1' \cap Y_1$ and at least one of the following conditions holds:*

(a) *There is $y \in Y_1$ such that $f[A_y] \nrightarrow S_{\mathcal{A}_{X_0'}}$.*
(b) *There is an infinite antichain M such that $f[M] \nrightarrow S_{\mathcal{A}_{X_0'}}$.*
(c) *There is $x \in Y_0$ such that $f^{-1}(A_x) \in \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{A}_{X_1'})$.*
(d) *There is an infinite antichain M such that $f^{-1}(M) \in \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{A}_{X_1'})$.*

Thus, by Lemma 6.7, we have that $f[S_{\mathcal{A}_{X_1'}}] \neq S_{\mathcal{A}_{X_0'}}$.

Proof. We need to consider two cases:

Case I. Suppose that $f[S_{\mathcal{A}_{X_1}}] \neq S_{\mathcal{A}_{X_0}}$. Notice that if the witnesses of the RK-incomparability is an antichain satisfying either (2) or (4) of Lemma 6.7, then we can extend arbitrarily $X_0 \subseteq X_0'$, $X_1 \subseteq X_1'$ and find Y_0, Y_1 such that $X_0' \cap Y_0 = \emptyset$ and $X_1' \cap Y_1 = \emptyset$ easily. Hence, either (b) or (d) holds. Now suppose that the witness is a branch that satisfies (1). There is $y \in 2^\omega \setminus X_1$ and $x \in X_0$ such that $|f[A_y] \cap A_x| = \omega$. Define $Y_1 = \{y\}$, $X_1' = X_1 \cup W$ where $W \subseteq 2^\omega \setminus Y_1$, and X_0', Y_0 arbitrarily such that $X_0' \cap Y_0 = \emptyset$. Thus we have (a). Assume now that the witness is a branch satisfying (3). There is $v \in 2^\omega \setminus X_0$ such that $f^{-1}(A_v) \in \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{A}_{X_1})$. Define $Y_0 = \{v\}$, $X_0' = X_0 \cup W$ where $W \subseteq 2^\omega \setminus Y_0$, and X_1', Y_1 arbitrarily such that $X_1' \cap Y_1 = \emptyset$. In this case (c) is satisfied. In each case we have one of the conditions.

Case II. Suppose that $f[S_{\mathcal{A}_{X_1}}] = S_{\mathcal{A}_{X_0}}$. We shall prove that X_0 and X_1 can be extend and find Y_0 and Y_1 so that their extensions will satisfy either (b) or (c).

(i) Assume that there are $y \in 2^\omega \setminus X_0$ and a nonempty finite set $\mathcal{B} \subseteq \{A_v : v \in 2^\omega\}$ such that $f^{-1}(A_z) \subseteq^* \bigcup \mathcal{B}$. Notice that $X_1 \setminus \{v \in 2^\omega : A_v \in \mathcal{B}\} \neq \emptyset$. In this case, we set $Y_0 = \{y\}$, $X_0' = X_0 \cup W$ where $W \subseteq 2^\omega \setminus Y_0$, $X_1' = X_1 \cup \{v \in 2^\omega : A_v \in \mathcal{B}\}$ and Y_1 a finite nonempty set such that $X_1' \cap Y_1 = \emptyset$. Thus, we have (c).

(ii) Now suppose that there is an antichain M and $x \in 2^\omega \setminus X_0$ such that $|f[M] \cap A_x| = \omega$. In this case, we put $X_0' = X_0 \cup \{x\}$, Y_0 a finite nonempty set such that $X_0' \cap Y_0 = \emptyset$. We can extend X_1 arbitrarily and find Y_1 a finite nonempty set such that $X_1' \cap Y_1 = \emptyset$. Hence, we have (b0).

If (i) and (ii) fail, then $f^{-1}(A_z) \in \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{A}_{2^\omega})^+$, for each $z \in 2^\omega \setminus X_0$, and for every infinite antichain M we have that $f[M] \in \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{A}_{2^\omega})^\perp$. Hence $f[M]$ cannot meet any branch A_y in an infinite set, for all $y \in 2^\omega$. Fix $z \in 2^\omega \setminus X_0$. As $f^{-1}(A_z) \in \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{A}_{2^\omega})^+$, then $f^{-1}(A_z)$ contains an infinite antichain K. Since $f[K]$ is infinite and $f[K] \subseteq f[f^{-1}(A_z)] = A_z$, we get a contradiction to the negation of (ii). Thus, either (i) or (ii) is satisfied. □

We are ready to construct an infinite RK-antichain with FU-filters of character equal to $\mathfrak{c}$.

Theorem 6.9. *For every infinite cardinal $\kappa < \mathfrak{c}$, there is a family $\{X_\alpha : \alpha < \kappa\} \subseteq [2^\omega]^\mathfrak{c}$ such that $\{S_{X_\alpha} : \alpha < \kappa\}$ is an RK-antichain.*

Proof. Let $\{f_\beta : \beta < \mathfrak{c}\}$ be an enumeration of all surjections $f_\beta : 2^{<\omega} \to 2^{<\omega}$ for which $f_\beta|_M$ is finite-to-one for every infinite antichain M. By an inductive procedure, for every $\beta < \mathfrak{c}$ we shall construct, for every $\alpha < \kappa$, sets $X_\beta^\alpha \subseteq 2^\omega$ and $Y_\beta^\alpha \subseteq 2^\omega$ so that:

(1) $X_\beta^\alpha \cap Y_\beta^\alpha = \emptyset$ for every $\alpha < \kappa$.
(2) $X_\mu^\alpha \subseteq X_\nu^\alpha$ and $Y_\mu^\alpha \subseteq Y_\nu^\alpha$ if $\mu < \nu < \mathfrak{c}$.
(3) For distinct $\gamma, \delta < \kappa$ one of the following conditions holds:
  (a) There is $x \in Y_{\beta+1}^\gamma$ such that $f_\beta[A_x] \nprec S_{\mathcal{A}_{X_{\beta+1}^\delta}}$.
  (b) There is an infinite antichain M such that $f_\beta[M] \nprec S_{\mathcal{A}_{X_{\beta+1}^\delta}}$.
  (c) There is $y \in Y_{\beta+1}^\delta$ such that $f_\beta^{-1}(A_y) \in \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{A}_{X_{\beta+1}^\gamma})$.
  (d) There is an infinite antichain M such that $f_\beta^{-1}(M) \in \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{A}_{X_{\beta+1}^\gamma})$.
(4) $|X_\beta^\alpha|, |Y_\beta^\alpha| \leq \kappa \cdot |\beta|$ for every $\alpha < \kappa$.

Choose arbitrary distinct elements $x_0, y_0 \in 2^\omega$ and define $X_0^\alpha = \{x_0\}$ and $Y_0^\alpha = \{y_0\}$, for every $\alpha < \kappa$. Assume that for $\beta < \mathfrak{c}$ the sets X_θ^α and Y_θ^α have been defined for all $\theta < \beta$ and $\alpha < \kappa$ so that all of them satisfy the conditions (1), (2), (3) and (4). If $\beta < \mathfrak{c}$ is a limit ordinal, then we define $X_\beta^\alpha = \bigcup_{\theta<\beta} X_\theta^\alpha$ and $Y_\beta^\alpha = \bigcup_{\theta<\beta} Y_\theta^\alpha$ for each $\alpha < \kappa$. Now, suppose that $\beta = \theta + 1$. We shall define $X_{\beta+1}^\alpha$ and $Y_{\beta+1}^\alpha$. Notice from (4) that

$$|2^\omega \setminus [(\bigcup_{\alpha<\kappa} X_\theta^\alpha) \cup (\bigcup_{\alpha<\kappa} Y_\theta^\alpha)]| = \mathfrak{c}.$$

Fix $\alpha < \kappa$. According to Lemma 6.8, for every $\gamma < \kappa$ we can find finite nonempty sets B_γ^α, C_γ^α, D_γ^α and E_γ^α so that the following conditions holds:

(i) $B_\gamma^\alpha \cup C_\gamma^\alpha \cup D_\gamma^\alpha \cup E_\gamma^\alpha \subseteq 2^\omega \setminus \big[\big(\bigcup_{\alpha<\kappa} X_\theta^\alpha\big) \bigcup \big(\bigcup_{\alpha<\kappa} Y_\theta^\alpha\big)\big]$.

(ii) One of the following conditions hold

  (a) There is $x \in Y_\theta^\alpha \cup D_\gamma^\alpha$ such that $f_\beta[A_x] \nprec S_{\mathcal{A}_{X_\theta^\gamma \cup C_\gamma^\alpha}}$.

  (b) There is an infinite antichain M such that $f_\beta[M] \nprec S_{\mathcal{A}_{X_\theta^\gamma \cup C_\gamma^\alpha}}$.

  (c) There is $y \in Y_\theta^\gamma \cup E_\gamma^\alpha$ such that $f_\beta^{-1}(A_y) \in \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{A}_{X_\theta^\alpha \cup B_\gamma^\alpha})$.

  (d) There is an infinite antichain M such that $f_\beta^{-1}(M) \in \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{A}_{X_\theta^\alpha \cup B_\gamma^\alpha})$.

(iii) $\big[(\bigcup_{\gamma\in\kappa\setminus\{\alpha\}} B_\gamma^\alpha) \cap \big[\bigcup_{\gamma\in\kappa\setminus\{\alpha\}} D_\gamma^\alpha\big] = \emptyset$

(iv) $\big[(\bigcup_{\gamma\in\kappa\setminus\{\alpha\}} C_\gamma^\alpha) \cap \big[\bigcup_{\gamma\in\kappa\setminus\{\alpha\}} E_\gamma^\alpha\big] = \emptyset$

Define

$$X_\beta^\alpha = X_\theta^\alpha \cup (\bigcup_{\gamma\in\kappa\setminus\{\alpha\}} B_\gamma^\alpha) \cup (\bigcup_{\gamma\in\kappa\setminus\{\alpha\}} C_\alpha^\gamma)$$

and

$$Y_\beta^\alpha = Y_\theta^\alpha \cup (\bigcup_{\gamma\in\kappa\setminus\{\alpha\}} D_\gamma^\alpha) \cup (\bigcup_{\gamma\in\kappa\setminus\{\alpha\}} E_\alpha^\gamma).$$

Conditions (1), (2), (3) and (4) are clearly satisfied. For every $\alpha < \kappa$ define $X_\alpha = \bigcup_{\beta<\mathfrak{c}} X_\beta^\alpha$. Thus, by the construction and Lemma 6.8 we have that, for every $\alpha, \gamma < \kappa$,

$$f_\beta[S_{\mathcal{A}_{X_\alpha}}] \neq S_{\mathcal{A}_{X_\gamma}}.$$

Therefore $\{S_{X_\alpha} : \alpha < \kappa\}$ is an infinite RK-antichain of FU-filters which have character equal to $\mathfrak{c}$.

□

We end the paper with the following question that the authors could not solve it.

Question 6.10. Is there an RK-antichain of FU-filters of size $\mathfrak{c}$?

References

1. A. V. Arhangel'skii, *The frequency spectrum of a topological space and the product operation*. Trans. Moscow Math. Soc., **40** (2) (1981), pp. 163–200.
2. A. Dow, *Two classes of Fréchet-Urysohn spaces*. Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **108** (1990), 241–247.
3. A. Dow and J. Steprāns, *Countable Fréchet α_1-spaces may be first countable*, in: Dept. of Math. of York Univ., Report no. 90-20.
4. S. Garcia-Ferreira and C. Uzcátegui, *Subsequential filters*. Top. Appl. **156** (2009), 2949–2959.
5. S. Garcia-Ferreira and J. E. Rivera-Gómez, *Ordering Fréchet-Urysohn Filters*. Topology Appl. 163 (2014), 128–141.

6. P. Nyikos, *The Cantor tree and the Fréchet-Urysohn property*, in: papers on general Topology and related Category theory and Topological Algebra. (Ann. New York Acad. Sci. 552), New York Acad. Sci., New York, **39** (1989), 109–123.
7. P. Nyikos, *Subsets of ${}^{\omega}\omega$ and the Fréchet-Urysohn and α_i properties*. Topology Appl. **48** (1992) 91–116.
8. P. Simon, *A hedghog in the product*. Acta. Univ. Carolin. Math. Phys. **39** (1998), 147-153.
9. P. Simon, *A countable Fréchet-Urysohn space of uncountable character*. Rocky Mtn. J. Math **155** (2008), 1129-1139.
10. F. Siwiec, *Generalizations of first axiom of countability*. Top. Appl. **5** (1975), 1-60.
11. S. Todorcevic and C. Uzcátegui, *Analytic k-spaces*. Top. Appl. **146/147** (2005), 511–526.

Centro de Ciencias Matemáticas, Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, Campus Morelia, Apartado Postal 61-3, Santa Maria, 58089, Morelia, Michoacán, México
E-mail address: sgarcia@matmor.unam.mx

Centro de Ciencias Matemáticas, Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, Campus Morelia, Apartado Postal 61-3, Santa Maria, 58089, Morelia, Michoacán, México
E-mail address: jonathan@matmor.unam.mx